



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/586,415	07/18/2006	Kenneth F. Bartizal	21610YP	4158
210 7590 05/06/2009 MERCK AND CO., INC P O BOX 2000 RAHWAY, NJ 07065-0907				
EXAMINER PESELEV, ELLI				
ART UNIT 1623		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 05/06/2009		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/586,415

Applicant(s)

BARTIZAL ET AL.

Examiner

Elli Peselev

Art Unit

1623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/86)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/18/2006, 7/18/2006
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: ____

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the abstract has not been presented in the proper domestic form. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claims 1-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for pharmaceutically acceptable salts and esters, does not reasonably provide enablement for prodrugs. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

A conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding each of the factors below, the specification, at the time the application was filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation.

(A) The breadth of the claims.

The claims encompass any prodrug of the claimed compounds.

(B) The state of the prior art.

Specific prodrugs of azalides are not known in the prior art.

(C) The level of predictability in the art.

It is well known in the pharmaceutical art that choosing a specific prodrug is highly unpredictable in that it cannot be ascertained a priori how a specific prodrug will affect the properties, such as activity, absorption etc., of a particular compound.

(D) The amount of direction provided by the inventor.

The inventor has not provided any examples of prodrugs.

(E) The existence of working examples.

No working examples of prodrugs have been provided.

(F) The quantity of experimentation needed to make and/or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure.

Because there is no way to predict a priori which specific prodrugs will result in a compound having desired activity and properties, it would take an enormous amount of trial and error to test a large number of possible prodrugs.

Claims 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for treating bacterial infections, does not reasonably provide enablement for preventing bacterial infections. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

A conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding each of the factors below, the specification, At the time the application was filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation.

(A) The breadth of the claims.

The broadest reasonable interpretation of the term infection merely requires that one microorganism gain entry into the cells of a host. There is no evidence that entry would be prevented.

(B) The state of the prior art.

The azalides are known antibacterial agents but are not known to be effective in preventing bacterial infections.

(C) The existence of working examples.

No working examples directed to the prevention of bacterial infections have been provided.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Claims 1-7, 10, 12-13 and 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Wang et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,645,941).

Wang et al disclose the claimed compounds having antibacterial activity (columns 2-5) and a process for preparing the claimed compounds (columns 23-32).

Claims 8, 9, 11 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,645,941).

Wang et al disclose 6,11-bicyclic azalides having antibacterial activity but do not disclose specific species encompassed by claims 8 and 9 and the combination of said azalides with additional antibacterial agents. However, it would have been prima facie obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to pick various species from the disclosure by Wang et al, because such a person would have expected said species to possess similar antibacterial activity. Further, the to combine two antibacterial agents into a single composition, would have been prima facie obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made because such a person would have expected the resulting combination to possess antibacterial activity.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elli Peselev whose telephone number is (571) 272-0659. The examiner can normally be reached on 8.00-4.30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Shaojia Jiang can be reached on (571) 272-0627. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Elli Peselev
/Elli Peselev/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1623